	Case 2:23-cv-01593-AC Document 9	Filed 08/25/23 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MICHAEL HILL,	No. 2:23-cv-1593 AC P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	JEFF LEIKAUF, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff has requested the appointment of counsel. ECF No. 8. In support of the request,	
18	plaintiff states that he is uncertain how court proceedings work. <u>Id.</u> at 1. He asks if he should	
19	send in documents – presumably in support of his case – now, or wait to send them in at a later	
20	date. He also states that because this is the first time he has been in custody, he has little legal	
21	knowledge of court proceedings. <u>Id.</u>	
22	The United States Supreme Court has ruled that district courts lack authority to require	
23	counsel to represent indigent prisoners in § 1983 cases. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490	
24	U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, the court may request the voluntary	
25	assistance of council pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 8 1015(a)(1). Torroll v. Provyor, 025 F.2d 1015, 1017	

assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). Neither plaintiff's indigence, nor his lack of education, nor his lack of legal expertise warrant the appointment of counsel. See Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990); see

26

27

28

also Bashor v. Risley, 730 F.2d 1228, 1234 (9th Cir. 1984) (finding court was within its discretion when it denied appointment of counsel to sixty-year-old appellant proceeding in forma pauperis with no background in law who thoroughly presented issues in petition). Therefore, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances in this case, and plaintiff's request for the appointment of counsel will be denied. Plaintiff is informed that the court will screen his complaint in due course in order to determine whether it may be served. At that time, if additional support for his complaint is needed, the screening order will say so. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's request for the appointment of counsel (ECF No. 8) is DENIED. DATED: August 24, 2023 Muson Clane

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE